

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 005127.00179	
<div>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]</div> <div>On _____</div> <div>Signature _____</div> <div>Typed or printed name _____</div>	Application Number 10/700,043	Filed November 4, 2003	
	First Named Inventor Derek CAMPBELL, et al.		
	Art Unit 3781	Examiner Mai, Tri M	
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"><div style="width: 45%;"><p>I am the</p><div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.</div><div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</div><div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>57,019</u></div><div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____</div></div><div style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"><u>/Elizabeth A. Almeter/</u> Signature</div><div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"><u>Elizabeth A. Almeter</u> Typed or printed name</div><div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"><u>(202) 824-3000</u> Telephone number</div><div style="margin-bottom: 10px;"><u>June 19, 2008</u> Date</div></div></div> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p>			

<input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Derek CAMPBELL *et al.*

Serial No.: 10/700,043

Filed: November 4, 2003

For: GOLF BAG BASE

Atty. Docket No.: 005127.00179

Group Art Unit: 3781

Examiner: Mai, Tri M.

Confirmation No.: 3120

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Box AF

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The review is requested for the reasons stated in the below remarks. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

Remarks

Having received and reviewed the final Office Action dated February 7, 2008, Applicants respectfully submit that the standing rejections are based on one or more clear errors, and that the appeal process can be avoided through a pre-appeal brief review as set forth in the Official Gazette notice of July 12, 2005.

The pending rejections fail to address all the claim limitations, and exhibit clear factual and legal errors with respect to the cited references. The specific error relied upon in this Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review includes the following:

- The Office made clear error in relying on U.S. Patent No. 6,938,762 to Cheng (hereinafter “Cheng ‘762”), in its rejection of claims 1, 4-11, 15-16, 20-28, 33, 34, and 36, as argued in Applicant’s Amendment and Response filed December 20, 2007, at pp. 12-13. In the Office’s final Office Action dated February 7, 2008, the Office States that the evidence provided in Applicants’ Declaration under Rule 1.131 is inadequate and inconsistent. *See* the final Office Action dated

February 7, 2008 at p. 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. In the final Office Action of September 21, 2007, the Office asserts that the “declaration fails to show that the bottom is made from one piece.” *See* the Final Office Action at p. 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. Several exhibits filed with the Declaration depict the bottom as being one piece. For instance, Exhibit C shows a one piece bottom. Durable inserts are shown in the figure but, as indicated in the exhibit, they are only included “as needed.” *See* Declaration Exhibit C filed March 19, 2007. In addition, Exhibit D, E, F and G depict the bottom as a single piece. Additional durable inserts are shown in Exhibit E. However, these inserts do not detract from the base itself being a single piece. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the Declaration filed does indeed show the base as being a single piece, as recited in independent claims 1, 20, and 38. Applicants have clearly stated in the Declaration where support for various claim features, particularly the features of independent claims 1, 20 and 38 are supported in the Declaration. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the evidence presented in the Declaration is sufficient to establish a date of conception and reduction to practice prior to May 28, 2003, the filing date of Cheng ‘762. Cheng ‘762 is therefore not valid as prior art against the present claims, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

- The Office made clear error in relying on U.S. Patent No. 6,386,362 to Cheng (hereinafter “Cheng ‘362”) in its rejection of claims 1, 6, 8-11, 15, 16, 18, 20-25, 33, and 34, as argued in Applicants’ Amendment and Request for Continued Examination filed December 20, 2008. The Office asserts that “Cheng ‘362 teaches a golf bag having a base including a one-piece element that extends around the second of the body and forms a support surface and defining a flexion line defining two pivotable portions.” *See* the final Office Action dated February 7, 2008 at p. 2. Applicants respectfully disagree. Cheng ‘362 describes a golf bag including a base seat that includes a front section, a rear section and a pivot section connected between the front and rear sections. Col. 2, lines 65-67. Cheng ‘362 clearly fails to teach or suggest a base *formed of a single piece* element extending substantially around the second end of the body. Rather, Chang ‘362 describes a multi-part base having a pivot section (40 in Figures 1-7) that is formed of a flexible material to facilitate bending of the base. Col. 3, lines 17-20. The pivot section is *connected between* the front and rear sections. Further, Cheng describes the front and rear sections as “halves of the base seat and the pivot section is positioned at the center of the base seat.” *See* Cheng ‘362 col. 4, lines 21-23. Cheng also describes the front and rear sections as able to be “*connected by an alternative measure*” rather

than by the aforesaid pivot section. *Id* at col. 4, lines 8-11. (Emphasis added) Therefore, Cheng ‘362 clearly fails to teach or suggest a base formed of a single piece element, as recited in independent claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1 and 20 are patentably distinct from Cheng ‘362.

- The amendments made in the Amendment and Request for Continued Examination filed December 20, 2008 were made in response to the assertion by the Office that the previously used claim term “‘one piece’ is broad and does not exclude the other part coming together to form one piece item.” *See* the Final Office Action dated September 21, 2007 at p. 4-5. Further, the Office asserts that the amended term “single piece” is broad and does not exclude the base of Cheng ‘362. *See* the final Office Action dated February 7, 2008 at p. 4-5. While Applicants do not agree with the assertion of the Office, Applicants assert that a base made from a plurality of parts, as described in Cheng ‘362, clearly can not be considered *formed of a single piece element*, as recited in claims 1 and 20.
- The Office made clear error in relying on U.S. Patent No. 6,568,527 to Te-Pin (hereinafter “Te-Pin”) in its rejection of claims 1, 4-11, 15, 16, 18, 20-28, 33, 34 and 36, as argued in Applicants’ Amendment and Request for Continued Examination filed December 20, 2007. The Office asserts that “Te-Pin teaches a golf bag having a base including a one-piece element that extend around the second of the body and forms a support surface and defining a flexion line defining two pivotable portions.” Applicants respectfully disagree. Te-Pin describes a golf bag that includes a base bracket. Col. 2, lines 48-49. The base bracket includes a front section, a rear section, a first flexible section disposed on the front section, a second flexible section disposed on the rear section and a connecting member connected between the first and second flexible sections. *See* Col. 2, lines 57-61 and FIGS. 1, 2, 4 and 5. The connecting member is disposed between the first and second flexible sections and is connected with outer edges of corresponding portions thereof. Col. 3, lines 33-35. A part of the connecting member is connected with the first and second flexible sections on the bottom of the base bracket, while another part is connected with the first and second flexible sections on the lateral side of the base seat. Col. 3, lines 35-40. The first and second sections are “connected together to form a larger receiving space.” Col. 3, lines 40-41.
- The Office asserts that the term “single piece” is broad and does not exclude the base of Te-Pin. *See* the final Office Action dated February 7, 2008 at p. 4-5. Applicants respectfully disagree. Clearly, Te-Pin fails to teach or suggest a base formed of a single piece element that extends

substantially around the second end of the body. In fact, Te-Pin describes a base including multiple parts connected together. For instance, the connecting member of Te-Pin is “bridged and connected between the first and second flexible sections by way of stitching.” Col. 4, lines 15-17. Note also Figs. 2, 4 and 5 of Te-Pin. As such, Te-Pin specifically teaches away from a base formed of a single piece element that extends substantially around the second end of the body, as recited in claims 1 and 20. Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 20 patentably distinguish from Te-Pin and request withdrawal of this rejection.

- The Office made clear error in relying on U.S. Patent No. 6,564,937 to Cheng (hereinafter “Cheng ‘937”) in its rejection of claims 1, 4, 7-11, 15, 16, 18, 20-27, 33, 34 and 36, as argued in Applicants Amendment and Request for Continued Examination filed December 20, 2007. The Office asserts that “Cheng ‘937 teaches a golf bag having a base including a one-piece element that extend around the second of the body and forms a support surface and defining a flexion line defining two pivotable portions.” *See* the final Office Action dated February 7, 2008 at p. 2. Applicants respectfully disagree. Cheng ‘937 describes a golf bag including a base having a front section and a rear section. Col. 3, lines 3-4. The bottom of the front section is open and a driving board is connected to the front section via a connecting structure. Col. 3, lines 12-31. The golf bag base of Cheng ‘937 includes multiple parts. *See* FIGS. 2 and 3. Clearly, Cheng ‘937 fails to teach or suggest a base formed of a single piece element that extends substantially around the second end of the body. Although the Office asserts that the term “single piece” is broad and does not exclude Cheng ‘937, Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that at least independent claims 1 and 20 are patentably distinct from Cheng ‘937.
- The Office made clear error in relying on Cheng ‘762, Cheng ‘362, Cheng ‘937 or Te-Pin, either alone or in combination with U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0200746 to Kang (hereinafter “Kang”) or U.S. Patent No. 3,941,398 to Nelson (hereinafter “Nelson”) in its rejection of claims 2, 29, 30, 38, 40-43, 46 and 47, as argued in Applicants Amendment and Request for Continued Examination filed December 20, 2007. Claims 2 and 29-30 depend from claims 1 and 20, respectively. As discussed above, none of the Cheng references or Te-Pin teaches or suggests all the features of claims 1 and 20. The addition of Kang or Nelson fails to cure the deficiencies of the Cheng references or the Te-Pin reference with respect to claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully assert that claims 2, 29 and 30 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

- The Office asserts that the Kang and Nelson references teach a base made of foam. However, this feature is not recited in independent claim 38. Independent claim 38 recites features similar to those recited in claims 1 and 20. For example, claim 38 recites, among other features, “[a] golf bag comprising: ...a base secured to the second end of the body, the base *formed of a single piece* element that extends substantially around the second end of the body” (Emphasis added). None of Cheng ‘762, Cheng ‘362, Cheng ‘937 or Te-Pin teaches or suggests the features of claim 38. The addition of Kang or Nelson fails to cure the deficiencies of these references with respect to claim 38 because neither Kang nor Nelson, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this base formed of a single piece element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 38 is allowable over the cited references.

While Applicants believe the above points represent the clearest errors made by the Office, Applicants reserve the right to appeal on other bases and errors. Applicants further reserve the right to address the rejections of any other claims not identified above on appeal should the appeal of this case proceed after the Office’s consideration of this paper.

CONCLUSION

All issues having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the review panel believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the review panel is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3174.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: June 19, 2008

By: /Elizabeth A. Almeter/
Elizabeth A. Almeter, Reg. No. 57,019
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001